

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
D. Child Identification and Referral. Child Find		
<p>1. Each public education agency shall establish, implement, and disseminate to its school-based personnel and all parents, within the public education agency boundaries of responsibility, written procedures for the identification and referral of all children with disabilities, aged birth through 21, including children with disabilities attending private schools and home schools, regardless of the severity of their disability.</p>	<p>1. Each public education agency (PEA) shall be responsible for implementing an ongoing child find system to locate, identify, and evaluate children suspected of having a disability from ages 3 through 21 within each PEA's defined enrollment boundaries. The child find system includes all children as defined in 34 CFR §300.111.</p> <p>2. Each PEA shall be responsible for making referrals to the Arizona Early Intervention Program for children from birth through age three.</p> <p>3. Public education agencies may implement general education interventions and to the extent possible, resolve the area of concerns in general education programs, such as would take place in a screening for instructional purposes, in accordance with 300.302, before initiating a referral for an evaluation of a suspected disability in collaborative decision-making with a parent.</p> <p>a. If a parent or guardian suspects that a child has a disability, the parent may at any time, inform</p>	<p>Expand definitions to include unincorporated areas and to include other state supported agencies that provide special education, e.g. ASDB</p> <p>Develop a Child Find System design.</p> <p>Add clarifying language about whether the responsibility of school districts begins at 2.6 or 2.9, 2.10 and a half years.</p> <p>Include info about Multi-Tier, UDL, general education interventions</p>
<p>2. Each public education agency will require all school-based staff to review the written procedures related to child identification and referral on an annual basis. The public education agency shall maintain documentation of staff review.</p>		<p>Give examples of "administrators" at different school levels e.g. HS, elem, K-12, virtual.</p>
<p>3. Procedures for child identification and referral shall meet the requirements of the IDEA and regulations, A.R.S. Title 15, Chapter 7, Article 4 and these rules.</p>		
<p>4. The public education agency responsible for child identification activities is the school district in which the parents reside unless:</p>		
<p>a. The student is enrolled in a charter school or public education agency that is not a school district. In that event, the charter school or public education agency is responsible for child identification</p>		

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
activities;		
b. The student is enrolled in a non-profit private school. In that event, the school district within whose boundaries the private school is located is responsible for child identification activities.	the school in writing. <i>The PEA then has 10 business days to acknowledge the request and to notify the parent or guardian in writing of the PEA's procedures to follow up on a suspected disability.</i>	
5. Identification (screening for possible disabilities) shall be completed within 45 calendar days after:		
a. Entry of each preschool or kindergarten student and any student enrolling without appropriate records of screening, evaluation, and progress in school; or	b. If a PEA suspects a child has a disability, it has 10 business days to notify the parent or guardian, in writing, of the suspected disability and the procedures to follow up on the suspected disability.	
b. Notification to the public education agency by parents of concerns regarding developmental or educational progress by their child aged 3 years through 21 years.		
6. Screening procedures shall include vision and hearing status and consideration of the following areas: cognitive or academic, communication, motor, social or behavioral, and adaptive development. Screening does not include detailed individualized comprehensive evaluation procedures.	4. At any time a PEA, subject to prior written notice requirements and procedural safeguards, may take either of the following actions within a reasonable period of time: a) deny the request or b) initiate a referral for an initial special education evaluation.	
7. For a student transferring into a school; the public education agency shall review enrollment data and educational performance in the prior school. If there is a history of special education for a student not currently eligible for special education, or poor progress, the name of the student		

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
shall be submitted to the administrator for consideration of the need for a referral for a full and individual evaluation or other services.		
8. If a concern about a student is identified through screening procedures or through review of records, the public education agency shall notify the parents of the student of the concern within 10 school days and inform them of the public education agency procedures to follow-up on the student's needs.		
9. Each public education agency shall maintain documentation of the identification procedures utilized, the dates of entry into school or notification by parents made pursuant to subsection (D)(5), and the dates of screening. The results shall be maintained in the student's permanent records in a location designated by the administrator. In the case of a student not enrolled, the results shall be maintained in a location designated by the administrator.		
10. If the identification process indicates a possible disability, the name of the student shall be submitted to the administrator for consideration of the need for a referral for a full and individual evaluation or other services. A parent or a student may request an evaluation of the student. For parentally-placed private school students the school district within whose boundaries		

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
the non-profit private school is located is responsible for such evaluation.		
11. If, after consultation with the parent, the responsible public education agency determines that a full and individual evaluation is not warranted, the public education agency shall provide prior written notice and procedural safeguards notice to the parent in a timely manner.		

Considerations, Recommendations and Suggestions for the Rule Committee

D. Child Find

- Took away some prescriptive rules (45 day screenings) but made others more burdensome (10 days rule).
- Reasonable period of time = undefined & may look very different depending on if you are a parents vs a large school system. A parent perceives their request as a long time before services and they're needed for FAPE
- A review of existing data is, by federal definition, the beginning of the evaluation. Can the intermediate 30 day step be a CST mtg. instead of a RED?
- I like plan 3 with the 10 day written notice to parents added into the 2nd bullet of 30 days black out days for summer- spring and Christmas breaks (any break in the school year of 1 full week or more
- Love the idea of changing practice but still need that 10 days to get back to parent with notice.
- When looking at the best timeline, combine options B & C so that the 10 days is added to part C. This allows a reasonable amount of time to be defined as 10 days to acknowledge the receipt of the parent request and inform parent of sped process. After that where a PWN is provided to inform of evaluation/no evaluation, district can have 30 days to hold ROED meeting if district is moving forward with evaluation.
- Upon receipt of parent request: contact/respond to parent within 10 days. PEA rep. explains pre-referral procedures (SST, RTI, etc). If parent agrees this is appropriate, PEA documents decision in PWN to parent & proceed safeguards, PWN includes timeline to f/u on interventions (6 weeks, etc)
- Plan to evaluate is developed within a team within 30 days (MET-1) meeting informed consent/DWN is collected @ this time the 60 day time line begins.

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
E. Evaluation/re-evaluation.		
<p>1. Each public education agency shall establish, implement, disseminate to its school-based personnel, and make available to parents within its boundaries of responsibility, written procedures for the initial full and individual evaluation of students suspected of having a disability, and for the re-evaluation of students previously identified as being eligible for special education.</p> <p>2. Procedures for the initial full and individual evaluation of children suspected of having a disability and for the re-evaluation of students with disabilities shall meet the requirements of IDEA and regulations, and state statutes and State Board of Education rules.</p> <p>3. The initial evaluation of a child being considered for special education, or the re-evaluation per a parental request of a student already receiving special education services, shall be completed as soon as possible, but shall not exceed 60 calendar days from receipt of informed written consent. If the public education agency initiates the evaluation, the 60-day period shall commence with the date of receipt of informed written consent and shall conclude with the date of the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team (MET) determination of eligibility. If the parent requests the evaluation and the MET</p>	<p>A. INITIAL EVALUATION A.1. A public agency must conduct a full and individual initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR Sec. 300.300 through 300.311, before the initial provision of special education and related services to a child with a disability under this part. A.2. Only the parent of the child and/or chief administrative official of the public education agency or person designated as special education official may initiate a request for an initial special education evaluation, as referenced in 34 CFR- §§ 300.301(b). A.3. A public education agency shall obtain informed written consent from the parent of the child before conducting an initial evaluation (34 CFR §§ 300.301, 300.503, 300.504, and 300.9). A.4. Public education agencies must complete an initial evaluation within 60 calendar days of receiving voluntary, informed written parental consent to do so (34 CFR §§ 300.301(c)(i) notwithstanding the exceptions in 34 CFR 300.301 2(e).</p> <p>B. REEVALUATION B. 1. The PEA must consider the reevaluation of each child with a disability at least every three years from the date of previous eligibility determination unless</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of school official – have a note to put in rule definitions for Guidance • Define the difference between Request and Referral • Define chief administrative official R 7 2 402 B3 ARS 15-761 • More information on the process • More information on who and what the process is • Address “voluntary” from IDEA • Referral vs request for evaluation – related to child find • Struggle with understanding screening and evaluation as related to assessment and when consent is needed (ie: FBAs) • Defining parent • Clarify - parent can determine how informed they are • custodial parent issues needs guidance/clarification • Guidance for when re-eval is deemed unnecessary • Recommendations for providing notice for when decisions take place with example PWNs to paint the variety of stories personnel

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
<p>concurs, the 60-day period shall commence with the date that the written parental request was received by the public education agency and shall conclude with the date of the MET determination of eligibility.</p> <p>4. The 60-day evaluation period may be extended for an additional 30 days, provided it is in the best interest of the child, and the parents and PEA agree in writing to such an extension. Neither the 60-day evaluation period nor any extension shall cause a re-evaluation to exceed the time-lines for a re-evaluation within three years of the previous evaluation.</p> <p>5. The public education agency may accept current information about the student from another state, public agency, public education agency, or independent evaluator. In such instances, the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team shall be responsible for reviewing and approving or supplementing an evaluation. to meet the requirements identified in subsections (E)(1) through (7).</p> <p>6. For the following disabilities, the full and individual initial evaluation shall include:</p> <p>a. Emotional disability: verification of a disorder by a psychiatrist, licensed psychologist, or a certified school psychologist.</p> <p>b. Hearing impairment:</p>	<p>the public agency and the parent agree that a reevaluation is not necessary in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.303 through 34 CFR §§300.311.</p> <p>B. 2. Informed written parental consent requirements apply pursuant to 34 CFR §§ 300.300(c) and 34 CFR §§ 300.301 prior to initiating the reevaluation.</p> <p>B. 3. Dismissal of service is subject to reevaluation requirements under 34 CFR §§ 300.305 (e).</p> <p>B.4. Public education agencies must complete the re-evaluation within 60 calendar days of receiving voluntary, informed written parental consent to do so. Up to a 30 calendar day extension is permissible provided that it is in the best interest of the child and mutually agreed upon.</p> <p>B. 5. Termination of services due to graduation or exceeding age of eligibility are not subject to reevaluation; however a summary of students performance is required pursuant to 34 CFR §§ 300.305 (e)(2) and required under 34 CFR §§ 300.305(e)(3)</p> <p>C. EVALUATION PROCEDURES</p> <p>C. 1. Upon analysis of pertinent data, the MET shall determine whether the child is a child with a disability as defined in IDEA (put in IDEA references) to the extent that specially designed instruction is required</p>	<p>experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were split – lots of support for meeting with parents before and some responses stating that it could be considered a delay • Understanding the evaluation plan – educators and parents • Define informed written consent – <u>how</u> does this look in education setting– See Ohio’s definition • Summer evaluation- blocked days – scenarios and example • Guidance on what is re-evaluation – and how to do a re-evaluation • Re-setting the timeline for re-evaluation – what resets the 3 year timeline – issues of eligibility vs supplement the evaluation to add related services • Add wording that makes it clear that the decision is with the parents – consent is voluntary • Provide scenarios and examples. Very rare instance - <i>If no additional data are needed to make an eligibility, or non-eligibility determination, the PEA is not required to obtain informed written consent.</i>

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
<p>i. An audiological evaluation by an audiologist, and</p> <p>ii. An evaluation of communication/language proficiency.</p> <p>c. Other health impairment: verification of a health impairment by a doctor of medicine.</p>	<p>in order for the child to benefit from education.</p> <p>C. 2. In making eligibility determinations, an LEA shall draw upon information from a variety of sources. An LEA shall ensure that information obtained from these sources as appropriate for each student, is documented and carefully considered in accordance with 34 CFR 300.306.</p> <p>C. 3. Eligibility determination meeting will be conducted subject to meeting notice requirements under Sec. 300.322.</p> <p>C. 4. An LEA shall provide a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of determination of eligibility to the parent.</p> <p>C. 5. If the child is determined eligible for special education, an IEP shall be developed within 30 days of eligibility determination, not to exceed 90 calendar days from the date of informed parental consent to conduct an initial evaluation.</p> <p>C. 6. The evaluation will be conducted by a team of qualified persons including parents and those with the appropriate expertise, certification and/or licensure as prescribed by Arizona law and 34 CFR 300.8</p> <p>D. Specific Learning Disability</p> <p>D.1. In determining the existence of a SLD the LEA shall use one or more of the methods to meet the criteria as identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational records – evaluation included or not – See Ohio’s example • Guidance on the 30 day extension – define mutually agreement and best interest of child • Suggested to separate out the re-evaluation for eligibility and assessment evaluation for additional services – see initial evaluation • Review of existing data conversation can add to the confusion – RED process could not be an evaluation – dispute resolutions’ interpretation • Re-evaluation must be completed vs considered for students – include best practices from the field – use of natural transition points • Guidance for variation of dates on services • Must have very clear concise guidance on this to represent the scenarios in which this is applicable • Assessment –Evaluation are not interchangeable and start using the words – additional/new data gathering – examples of each of these and scenarios – link to IDEA language 300.300(c) I to ii • Clarify this for eligibility and service

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
	under IDEA section 300.307 and determination requirements under 309,310 311.	<p>provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the Qualified and Expertise • Clarify how this will be accomplished – justification for dismissal – examples and scenarios • Include in guidance as to how this relates to related services • Guidance on what the summary of students performance contains • Clarify the development of an evaluation plan include? • No timeline for a mid-way re-eval – See Sarah for definition of midway Should clarify that when you evaluate that it should be subject to 60 day timeline • How we notify parents that evaluation is completed • What is the indicator that the evaluation is complete -Completion of evaluation activities and the marker to indicate completion - • Some common expectations for what designates the end of the evaluation • Parent input is part of the evaluation plan. If parent is not available, then he/she needs to be contacted • Guidance on the markers for indicating the evaluation is

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
		<p>completed – and when the 60 day timeline ends and timeline for the MET</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the confusion transition between the completion of the evaluation and the determination of eligibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working within your scope practice – professional licensure determines your scope of practice Who is qualified person Medical diagnosis versus educational eligibility Eligibility meeting IEP and Eligibility determination can be on the same day Guidance for the use/need for supplemental evaluation for FAPE vs eligibility
<p>d. Specific learning disability: a determination of whether the child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, state-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development that meets the public education agency criteria through one of the following methods:</p>		<p>Provide frameworks and suggestions of RtI models; clarify rule outs such as “due to lack of appropriate instruction”.</p> <p>Use Copenhagen document to assist with guidance document and related concern by Committee member.</p> <p>Observations – what can be used?</p>

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
		<p>Ability level of intellectual development and how to determine this in the event parent does not consent or there is a question of validity of assessment results – further discussion</p> <p>Rate of learning – define/give meaning? Sufficient progress – examples?</p> <p>Discussion and reason why we went to the flexibility of multiple measures: the movement from sole reliance on discrepancy of intellectual functioning</p> <p>Can use blended approach/models</p> <p>Considerations for working /identifying Dyslexia</p> <p>Flexibility of data collected</p> <p>LEA must identify criteria used</p> <p>Descriptions of models used to determine SLD</p>
i. A discrepancy between achievement and ability;		
ii. The child’s response to scientific, research-based interventions; or		

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
iii. Other alternative research-based procedures.		
e. Orthopedic impairment: verification of the physical disability by a doctor of medicine.		
f. Speech/language impairment: an evaluation by a certified speech-language therapist.		
g. For students whose speech impairments appear to be limited to articulation, voice, or fluency problems, the written evaluation may be limited to:		
i. An audiometric screening within the past calendar year,		
ii. A review of academic history and classroom functioning,		
iii. An assessment of the speech problem by a speech therapist, or		
iv. An assessment of the student's functional communication skills.		
h. Traumatic brain injury: verification of the injury by a doctor of medicine.		
i. Visual impairment: verification of a visual impairment by an ophthalmologist or optometrist.		
7. The Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team shall determine, in accordance with the IDEA and regulations, whether the requirements of subsections (E)(6)(a) through (i) are required for a student's re-evaluation.		

Considerations, Recommendations and Suggestions for the Rule Committee

E. Initial Evaluation, Re-Evaluation and Evaluation Procedures

- Elig. Det. May be outside of evaluation (Proposed). That sounds more like assessment then, not evaluation. Important point is that in order to improve their outcomes, they need services in place.
- Consider all kinds of PEA's. Some may take advantage but can we put something in place to protect without burdening.
- I like the flexibility- a meeting notice with notice of completed evaluation a good idea. Only the parent of the child (guardian) of chief admin. Or special education official able to make request for evaluation- needs to stay this way
- Other Health Impairment – eliminate need for verification by a doctor of medicine
- Love the clarity & simplicity of these proposed Rule changes. Reducing extra restrictions in AZ rules compare to federal rules is excellent.
- Child find- If ADE established firm calendar days- allow for a 30 day extension if both parties agree in writing for "Ext
- Request for evaluation- who is the "parent" CPS, Guardian, Surrogate Parent
- Evaluation Procedures- Can we except evaluation from Mexico professionals

Add in AZ language: Determination of Eligibility. (1) Upon analysis of intervention and assessment data, the ARC shall determine whether the child is a child with a disability as defined in Section 1(9) of 707 KAR 1:280 to the extent that specially designed instruction is required in order for the child to benefit from education. An LEA shall provide a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of determination of eligibility to the parent.

(2) A child shall not be determined to be eligible if the determinant factor for that eligibility determination is:

(a) A lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction as established in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 6301;

(b) A lack of appropriate instruction in math; or

(c) Limited English proficiency and the child does not otherwise meet eligibility criteria.

(3) In making eligibility determinations, an LEA shall draw upon information from a variety of sources, which may include:

(a) Response to scientific, research-based interventions;

(b) Vision, hearing, and communication screenings;

(c) Parental input;

(d) Aptitude and achievement tests;

(e) Teacher recommendations;

(f) Physical condition;

(g) Social or cultural background;

(h) Adaptive behavior; or

(i) Behavioral observations.

(4) An LEA shall ensure that information obtained from these sources as appropriate for each student, is documented and carefully considered.

(5) In making a determination under the category of mental disability, the ARC may apply a standard error of measure, if appropriate.

(6) If a determination is made that a child has a disability and needs special education and related services, an IEP shall be developed for the child.

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
F. Parental Consent.		
1. A public education agency shall obtain informed written consent from the parent of the child with a disability before the initial provision of special education and related services to the child	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	
2. If the parent of a child fails to respond to a request for, or refuses to consent to, the initial provision of special education and related services, the public education agency may not use mediation or due process procedures in order to obtain agreement or a ruling that the services may be provided to the child.	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	
3. If the parent of the child refuses to consent to the initial provision of special education and related services, or the parent fails to respond to a request to provide consent for the initial provision of special education and related services, the public education agency:	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	
a. Will not be considered to be in violation of the requirement to make available FAPE to the child because of the failure to provide the child with the special education and related services for which the parent refuses to or fails to provide consent, and	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	
b. Is not required to convene an IEP Team meeting or develop an IEP in accordance with these rules.	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	
4. If, at any time subsequent to the initial provision of special education and related services, the parent of a child revokes consent in writing for the continued	Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section	

<p>provision of special education and related services, the public education agency:</p> <p>a. May not continue to provide special education and related services to the child, but shall provide prior written notice before ceasing the provision of special education and related services;</p> <p>b. May not use the mediation procedures or the due process procedures in order to obtain agreement or a ruling that the services may be provided to the child;</p> <p>c. Will not be considered to be in violation of the requirement to make FAPE available to the child because of the failure to provide the child with further special education and related services; and</p> <p>d. Is not required to convene an IEP Team meeting or develop an IEP for the child for further provision of special education and related services.</p>		
<p>5. If a parent revokes consent in writing for their child's receipt of special education services after the child is initially provided special education and related services, the public agency is not required to amend the child's education records to remove any references to the child's receipt of special education and related services because of the revocation of consent.</p>	<p>Embedded in multiple sections vs separate section</p>	

Considerations, Recommendations and Suggestions for the Rule Committee

F. Parental Consent

--

DRAFT

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
G. Individualized Education Program (IEP).		
1. Each public education agency shall establish, implement, and disseminate to its school-based personnel, and make available to parents, written procedures for the development, implementation, review, and revision of IEPs.	Eliminate	Policies and procedures – connect to the Part B grant process Guidance on establishing board policies
2. Procedures for IEPs shall meet the requirements of the IDEA and regulations, and state statutes and State Board of Education rules.	G.1 Each public education agency (PEA) shall ensure an IEP is developed and implemented for each child with a disability (34 CFR 300.8) served by the PEA in accordance with 34 CFR 300.320-328.	refer back to 3 foundational pieces of IDEA??? Guidance need for comparable services for transfer students in or out of state.
3. Procedures shall include the incorporation of Arizona Academic Standards into the development of each IEP. IEP goals aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards shall identify the specific level within the Standard that is being addressed.	G.2 In the development of the IEP, the team shall consider the strengths and needs of the student in the context of the state adopted standards and the general education curriculum of the district. If the student's expected progress toward annual goals substantially deviates from what was anticipated the team will reconvene. G.3 The IEP shall include specially designed instruction (CFR 300.39), supplementary aids and services (CFR 300.42), transition planning (CFR	Guidance for progress – how to progress monitor, rate of progress for students in the content area How do we bring clarity to what progress means to each child? How do we set high expectations for performance for swd? Suggestion: <u>Lisa Aaroe: this is a preservice IHE impact</u> Make clear the difference between

	<p>300.43), and related services (CFR 300.34) <i>that enable the student to access and make progress in the general curriculum implemented by a provider(s) as determined appropriate by the IEP team pursuant to CFR 300.320.</i></p> <p><i>Seek input from the larger group - Require transition planning to begin at age 14</i></p> <p><i>Require transition planning to begin at the first IEP of the student's 9th grade year but not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns 16.</i></p> <p><i>Should we have a rule that requires transition services to begin before 16 if so at what age or grade level should it be?</i></p>	<p>curriculum, methodology, etc. Clarify the peer-reviewed, evidence-based, research-based</p> <p>Add definition of when curriculum is used vs IDEA standpoint of accessing curriculum. We need to give examples of related service providers (not just ot, pt, slp). Services are based on skill deficits.</p> <p>We need to also include transition services (e.g., goals versus services). Transition Assessments eligible for IEE?</p> <p>Make it clear what is deemed as "appropriate" personnel? Also, we need to provide clear guidance (long term sub document). We need to make clear what an "appropriate" provider entails. Make it clear for students who are in general education all or majority of day.</p> <p>Reference page 87 in IDEA 5th edition and Pg 48 in cross walk</p> <p><i>Make sure the definition of what is "certified", "highly qualified", etc. with some examples of how one can be one and not the other. This needs to be somewhere (not necessarily here). Maybe list out according to State Board rule.</i></p>
--	---	---

		<p><i>Seek the information from the Rule on ECAPS</i></p> <p><i>Training on transition activities and services</i></p>
<p>4. Each IEP of a student with a disability shall stipulate the provision of instructional or support services by a special education teacher, certified speech-language therapist, and/or ancillary service provider(s), as appropriate.</p>	<p>Eliminate</p>	<p>Define ancillary service????</p>
<p>5. Each student with a disability who has an IEP shall participate in the state assessment system. Students with disabilities can test with or without standard accommodations as indicated in the student's IEP. Students who are determined to have a significant cognitive disability based on the established eligibility criteria will be assessed with the state's alternate assessment as determined by the IEP team.</p>	<p>G4 Each student with a disability who has an IEP shall participate in the state established assessment system based on the State's established eligibility criteria.</p>	<p>Parent request considerations of alternate assessments</p> <p>Explanation of why can't participate and why selected assessment is appropriate for the child</p> <p>Address process considerations from writing IEP goals/accommodations and their application in a testing situation.</p> <p>Make it clear that every student needs to take a state assessment if this is taken out. Indicator for participation could also be explained.</p> <p>Appropriate accommodations to define accommodations and modifications that meet the needs of the student not a laundry list of all accommodations and modifications</p>

		<p>Guidance that addresses IEP teams do not have the authority to act outside of the states authority on state assessment system</p> <p>Difference between accommodations and modifications for state assessments and district or other assessments.</p> <p>IEP teams on how to make informed accurate accommodations for modifications that match the needs of students</p>
<p>6. A meeting shall be conducted to review and revise each student's IEP at least annually or more frequently if the student's progress substantially deviates from what was anticipated. The public education agency shall provide written notice of the meeting to the parents of the student to ensure that parents have the opportunity to participate in the meeting.</p>	Eliminate	<p><i>Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How to inform Parents when it is appropriate to ask for multiple requests/ Frequency</i> • <i>How to decide when topic was addressed in prior IEP meeting</i> • <i>LEA may deny a parent request for another IEP meeting "IF" the topic was addressed in a previously held IEP for which a PWN was issued</i> • <i>Discuss variables that impact student progress</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Attendance/Truancy</i> ➤ <i>Referrals</i> ➤ <i>Community, Domestic Changes</i> ➤ <i>Medical Changes</i> • <i>Note: Use structure of Idaho and Utah's documents. We need to we capture transfer student information.</i>
<p>7. A parent or public education agency may request in writing a review of the IEP. Such review shall take place within</p>	<p>G5 Any member of the IEP team can request to convene the IEP team to review and revise the IEP when</p>	<p>Define what triggers a meeting</p> <p>Aligned to the spirit of IDEA</p> <p>Guidance for when a refusal to meet is</p>

15 school days of the receipt of the request or at a mutually agreed upon time but not to exceed 30 school days.	necessary, consistent with IDEA CFR 300.324. LEA must respond to the request within a reasonable amount of time pursuant to IDEA notification requirements.	done Define what documentation would be with this request when the request comes from someone other than the parent – outside agency, teacher or on behalf of the parent or with the permission of the parent The prior written notice requirement is contextual – if the other agency is asking on behalf of the family or parent. FERPA may be referenced.
--	---	--

Considerations, Recommendations and Suggestions for the Rule Committee
G. IEP

Committee to Revise the State Board Rules Governing Special Education		
Current	Proposed	Guidance
H. Least Restrictive Environment		
1. Each public education agency shall establish, implement, and disseminate to its school-based personnel, and make available to parents, written procedures to ensure the delivery of special education services in the least restrictive environment as identified by IDEA and regulations, and state statutes and State Board of Education rules.		
2. A continuum of services and supports for students with disabilities shall be available through each public education agency.		

Considerations, Recommendations and Suggestions for the Rule Committee
H. Least Restrictive Environment